

Mount Vernon Master Plan
Development Committee Meeting
April 19, 2012

Meeting Minutes

1. Infill Development Massing Studies
 - a. Purpose
 - i. The purpose of the massing studies is to demonstrate the development potential of these sites under the existing CHAP and URP regulations and the proposed TransForm Baltimore comprehensive Zoning Code re-write and rezoning. The massing studies are a tool to evaluate those current regulations in order to make recommendations (Should they stay the same? Change?). The massing studies are not intended to recommend a development massing, only to be illustrative of the “worst case scenario” under the current CHAP and URP regulations and TransForm Baltimore Version 2.
 - b. Presentation
 - i. David Benn and Conor Brady (Cho Benn Holback + Associates)
 - ii. Presentation of infill development schematic designs at the 90% level
 - c. Discussion on sites
 - i. Site 1
 1. Parking on rowhome lot is cheaper than structured parking, so is realistic for a developer’s approach to the site under the current regulations (CHAP, URP and TransForm Baltimore Draft 2). Current regulations would require screening of surface parking.
 2. Whether or not the rowhome lot should be permitted to be used as surface parking in conjunction with the development issue will be discussed as a comment on TransForm Baltimore Draft 2 at our meeting on 5/12.
 - ii. Site 2
 1. You can’t go up to the height limit with all residential use because of the residential density controls of the O-R-2 zoning. This forces you to do a mixed use (more office or commercial) on the upper floors to max out the height.
 2. Maxing out the height would also be challenging while meeting the off-street parking requirements because of the small size of the site. One option would be to use automated parking.
 - iii. Site 3
 1. This analysis includes the historic structure also on the site
 - a. This scheme includes the demolition of a rear addition to the historic building. Although CHAP staff would feel comfortable recommending that this building be found non-contributing, the final determination would be made by the Commission.
 - b. If you were more aggressive in demolishing the rear of the existing structure, you could potentially achieve a larger footprint for the residential tower.

2. Office is proposed for the first two stories in the new construction above the structured parking because of the difficulty in getting the window opening necessary for residential use.
 - a. Office use here might be attractive because there is very little office space in Mount Vernon with larger floor plates that are attractive to potential tenants.
 3. The parking for this site lays out very efficiently and could potentially be increase beyond what is required by zoning to serve the broader public.
- iv. Site 4
1. The residential tower is set back from Maryland Avenue such that the pedestrian level massing is compatible with the adjacent historic rowhomes that will be retained.
 2. You could potentially have more height on the corner portion of the site (Comprehensive Care Care) if it were similarly stepped-back on upper floors. However, this additional area would need to be office because the residential density is already maxed out on the tower.
 3. The parking for this site lays out very efficiently and could potentially be increase beyond what is required by zoning to serve the broader public.
- v. Site 5
1. Off-street parking isn't required under the C-1 zoning, but some is provided due to need in order to make residential units marketable.
 2. Only Tyson Street properties are with CHAP and URP.
- d. General comments
- i. TransForm Baltimore issues (to be discussed at our meeting on 5/12)
 1. Residential density requirements (minimum lot area)
 - a. Is enough residential density permitted to use the full height permitted? If not, should additional residential density be permitted?
 - b. Why are the lot area requirements for residential different between O-R-2 and C-2? Where did these numbers come from?
 2. Off-street parking requirements
 - a. We need a joint meeting with the Transportation & Parking Committee to discuss the off-street parking requirements in TransForm Baltimore once the Parking Study is complete.
 - ii. Incentives for development
 1. There is a need to incentivize development because of the barriers to developing these lots, including:
 - a. current income from surface parking use
 - b. inefficiencies in managing smaller residential developments
 - c. high construction costs for small/awkward sites
 2. Potential development incentives
 - a. Reduce off-street parking requirement if you have zipcar onsite
 - b. Height/density bonus is certain criteria are met:
 - i. Setbacks from property lines
 - ii. Public art/open space
 - iii. Providing off-street parking beyond the zoning requirement that is available to the public
 - iv. Green building/LEED beyond the City's requirement

- e. Next steps
 - i. Draft massing studies to be distributed to the Committee via email with a public comment period
 - ii. Finalize Massing Study before Cho Benn Holback's contract with the City ends on 5/26
- 2. Working session (5/12)
 - a. Review URP in depth to identify
 - i. Regulatory needs
 - ii. Opportunities to streamline regulatory layers
 - b. Address TransForm comments from Massing Study process
- 3. Next steps
 - a. Finalize Committee's midterm draft recommendations/next steps for presentation at the upcoming General Meeting (6/19)
 - i. Schedule 1-2 Committee meetings as needed after 5/12 and before 6/19